

V. REMARKS

The Office Action requires that the Applicants identify the "means for adjusting ...arm (3)" in claim 4. Claim 4 has been canceled.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claim 4 is canceled and therefore the rejection as applied thereto is now moot. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 5 in 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Lynch (U.S. Patent No. 5,587,074). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Lynch discloses a backflush conduit for an automatic backflushing filter that includes a flared inlet portion, an outlet portion and a transition portion. The flared inlet portion converges inwardly from an inlet aperture in the direction of backflushing flow. The outlet portion has a generally cylindrical shape and is oriented at an angle with respect to the inlet portion. The transition portion connects the inlet portion and the outlet portion. The transition portion turns through the angle while converging to the outlet portion. The inlet portion has an interior with upper and lower walls. The upper and lower walls are symmetrical and convex relative to each other and converge in the direction of backflushing flow through the conduit toward the transition portion. The conduit has a streamlined interior contour to enhance fluid flow therethrough and supports a substantially even rate of fluid flow across the inlet aperture.

Claim 1, as amended, is directed to a filter for filtering solid particles from a flowing liquid, especially for use in steam condensers and heat exchangers in thermal and nuclear power plants. Claim 1 recites that the filter includes a cylindrical housing (4) extending longitudinally along and about a central axis, a conically-shaped screen basket (2) located within the housing (4), a debris discharge pipe (1) extending longitudinally along and about the central axis within the housing (4) and operative for discharging accumulated and captured debris; a debris extractor arm (3) connected to and extending from the debris discharge pipe (1) and located at a predetermined distance above the screen so as to maintain an open gap between the bottom surface of the debris extractor arm and the screen

basket (2). Claim 1 recites that the debris extractor arm (3) is rotatably driven over the entire length of the screen basket (2) and has a curvature towards the screen extending outwards at a predetermined radius with a respective vertical plane to create a low pressure between the debris extractor arm (3) and the screen basket (2) for complete extraction of debris and conveying to the debris discharge pipe (1). Additionally, claim 1 recites that the liquid flows in a first longitudinal direction within the housing (4) such that unfiltered liquid flows towards the screen basket (2) in the first longitudinal direction and, after being filtered, filtered liquid flows away from the screen basket (2) in the first longitudinal direction while debris-laden liquid flows in a second longitudinal direction being opposite the first longitudinal direction and the conically-shaped screen basket (2) tapers in the first longitudinal direction.

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection is improper because the applied art fails to teach each element of claim 1 as amended. Specifically, it is respectfully submitted that the applied art fails to teach that the liquid flows in a first longitudinal direction within the housing (4) such that unfiltered liquid flows towards the screen basket (2) in the first longitudinal direction and, after being filtered, filtered liquid flows away from the screen basket (2) in the first longitudinal direction while debris-laden liquid flows in a second longitudinal direction being opposite the first longitudinal direction and a conically-shaped screen basket (2) tapers in the first longitudinal direction. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the applied art.

Claims 2, 3, 5 and 6 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are allowable at least for the reason claim 1 is allowable as well as for the features they recite.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Lynch alone for further in view of either one of JP 44-006495 or Streander (U.S. Patent No. 2,131,002).

Claim 4 is canceled and therefore the rejection as applied thereto is now moot.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Lynch view of Muller (U.S. Patent No. 4,867,879). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

A device for mechanically purifying liquids in a pipeline includes a rotation-symmetrical sieve chamber forming a section of the pipeline and having an inlet with a central axis, a rotation-symmetrical sieve body having an inner surface and being disposed in the sieve chamber at an angle of substantially 30.degree. to 60.degree. relative to the central axis of the inlet, and a suction removal device for removing deposits from part of the inner surface of the sieve body, the suction removal device being coaxial with and upstream of the sieve body in flow direction of the liquid, and the sieve body and the suction removal device being rotatable relative to each other for successively sweeping all of the inner surface of the sieve body with the suction removal device.

Muller discloses a device for mechanically purifying liquids in a pipeline that includes a rotation-symmetrical sieve chamber forming a section of the pipeline and having an inlet with a central axis, a rotation-symmetrical sieve body having an inner surface and being disposed in the sieve chamber at an angle of substantially 30° to 60° relative to the central axis of the inlet, and a suction removal device for removing deposits from part of the inner surface of the sieve body. The suction removal device is coaxial with and upstream of the sieve body in flow direction of the liquid, and the sieve body and the suction removal device are rotatable relative to each other for successively sweeping all of the inner surface of the sieve body with the suction removal device.

Claim 7, as amended, is directed to a cooling system that includes an inlet (9) and an outlet (8) for cooling water, a debris filter, a debris outlet valve (10), a debris output pipe (11) and a condenser (12) for heat transfer. Claim 7 recites that the debris filter includes those features now recited in claim 1, as amended.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that that the rejection is improper because the applied art fails to teach each element of claim 4 as amended. Specifically, it is respectfully submitted that the applied art fails to teach that the liquid flows in a first

longitudinal direction within the housing (4) such that unfiltered liquid flows towards the screen basket (2) in the first longitudinal direction and, after being filtered, filtered liquid flows away from the screen basket (2) in the first longitudinal direction while debris-laden liquid flows in a second longitudinal direction being opposite the first longitudinal direction and the conically-shaped screen basket (2) tapers in the first longitudinal direction. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that claim 7 is allowable over the applied art.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Newly-added claims 8-11 also include features not shown in the applied art.

Further, Applicants assert that there are also reasons other than those set forth above why the pending claims are patentable. Applicants hereby reserve the right to submit those other reasons and to argue for the patentability of claims not explicitly addressed herein in future papers.


In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper or if a Petition for Extension of Time is required for timely acceptance of the same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 18-0013 for any such fees and Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 12, 2006

By:



David T. Nikaido
Reg. No. 22,663

Carl Schaukowitch
Reg. No. 29,211

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
1233 20th Street, N.W. Suite 501
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: (202) 955-3750
Fax: (202) 955-3751
Customer No. 23353

Enclosure(s): Amendment Transmittal
 Petition for Extension of Time (one month)

DC233790.DOC